

GRAUSTARK

#326 1974GO, 1974GP, 1974HO, 1974IA, 1975H, 1975O, 74.12a 22 March 1975

1974HQ "Fall 1902"

GERMAN AMPHIBIOUS LANDING IN SWEDEN

The English move F Edi-Nth was inadvertently left out of the last issue; players were informed by the Gamesmaster.

ENGLAND (T. Scanlan): F Ska S GERMAN A Ber-Swe; F Nth-Nwy; F Ber S F Nth-Nwy.

FRANCE (Lariton): F Mar-Lyo; A Spa-Mar; F Mid-Eng; A Pic-Bel; A Bur S A Pic-Bel.

GERMANY (McCullam): F Bel-Eng; A Ruh-Bur; A Boh-Mun; A Ber-Swe; F Bel C A Ber-Swe; A Den S A Ber-Swe.

ITALY (Drakert): A Tyr S AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN A Tri-Vie; A Tus-Ven; F Apu S A Tus-Ven; F Ion-Eas.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (McKeon): A Tri-Vie; A Bud-Rum; A Gre-Bul; A Ser S A Gre-Bul; F Aeg-Smy.

RUSSIA (Stewart): A Fin S F Nwy; F Swe S F Nwy; A Gal S ITALIAN A Tyr-Vie; A Ukr S F Rum; F Rum S TURKISH A Bul; F Nwy holds.

TURKEY (Muszynski): A Bul holds; F Bla S A Bul; A Con-Smy.

Underlined moves are not possible. Russia must either retreat F Swe-Bot or remove it; this can be sent in with the "Winter 1902" moves, which may be made conditional upon it. The High Combatant Powers now control the following supply centers:

ENGLAND: Edi, Liv, Lon. (3)
FRANCE: Bre, Mar, Par, Por, Spa. (5)
GERMANY: Bel, Ber, Den, Hol, Kie, Mun, Swe. (7)

(continued on p. 4)

1975H "Fall 1901"

ITALY GETS DALMATIAN SPOTS

ENGLAND (Morgan): A Edi-Nwy; F Nrg C A Edi-Nwy; F Nth S FRENCH A Bur-Bel.

FRANCE (Grayson): A Bur-Bel; A Spa-Por; F Mid-Spa(n.c.).

GERMANY (Chafetz): F Den holds; A Kie-Hol; A Ruh-Bel.

ITALY (Lariton): F Ton-Tun; A Tyr-Tri; A Ven S A Tyr-Tri.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (Enigh): A Vie-Tyr; A Ser-Tri; F Alb-Gre.

RUSSIA (Berman): F Bot-Swe; F Rum holds; A War-Gal; A Ukr S F Rum.

TURKEY (Silver): F Bla-Sev; A Bul-Rum; A Con-Bul.

Underlined moves are not possible. The High Combatant Powers now control the following supply centers:

ENGLAND: Edi, Liv, Lon, Nwy. (4)
FRANCE: Bel, Bre, Mar, Par, Por, Spa. (6)
GERMANY: Ber, Den, Hol, Kie, Mun. (5)
ITALY: Nap, Rom, Tri, Tun, Ven. (5)
AUSTRIA-HUNGARY: Bud, Gre, Ser, Vie. (4)
RUSSIA: Mos, St.P, Rum, Swe, War. (5)
TURKEY: Ank, Bul, Con, Sev, Smy. (5)
France may build three new units, Germany, Italy, and Turkey may each build two, and England, Austria-Hungary, and Russia may each build one. The deadline for these "Winter 1901" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 12 APRIL 1975.

Thanks for the many press releases; if there wasn't room in this issue they'll appear in #327. In the '75H release "1980's" should be "1890's"!

VAGARIES OF THE NORTH AMERICAN POSTAL SYSTEMS

1. Canada. Canadian readers of GRAUSTARK write that a postal strike threatens in their country. If it should come to pass, then all GRAUSTARK games involving Canadian players will automatically be suspended until the fourth Saturday after the United States Postal Service lifts the embargo which it places on mail to Canada under such circumstances. Presently those games are 1974IA and 19750.

2. The United States of America. A USPS strike is being rumored for this spring. If this should happen, then all deadlines in GRAUSTARK games will be re-set for the fourth Saturday after the end of the strike.

3. Brooklyn. GRAUSTARK #325 was collated on its publication date, 1 March 1975, with the welcome assistance of Ben Miller. On that same afternoon it was mailed in a street corner mailbox near my home. A few days later New York City readers complained by phone that it hadn't arrived, and when the copies did get to their destinations it was revealed that they were postmarked on 5 March. Gary Tesser, GRAUSTARK's consultant on the idiosyncracies of the USPS, suggested that the mailbox might have been frozen shut, and not capable of being opened until the weather cleared. Since that weekend was indeed the coldest of the winter here, I suspect that this is in fact what happened.

74.12a

"Spring 1940"

GERMANY FAR AHEAD OF THE PACK

USA (Hendry): Bri 5, Fra 5, Ger 5, Ita 5, Pol 2.
 FRANCE (Potts): No moves received: Fra 14.
 BRITAIN (Lariton): Fra 12, USA 6.
 RUSSIA (Heuer): Bri 8, USA 8.
 GERMANY (Zimmermann): Bri 12, Fra 12, Ita 5, Rus 5,
 USA 16.

The deadline for "Fall 1940" moves, the final moves in this game, is NOON, SATURDAY 12 APRIL 1975. Players should be sure to name a NYSE-listed stock with their attacks under the rules for postal Origins.

The maximum possible score for each player at this point is Germany 22, USA 19, Britain 16, Russia 15, France 9. The minimum possible score for each player is Germany 18, Russia 10, Britain 2, USA 0, France 0. In many cases these possible scores are incompatible with one another, and all depend on what "Fall 1940" attacks could possibly be made, and how they might be adjudicated.

	USA	Fra	Bri	Rus	Ger
Als					
Aus					C
Bal				C	C
Bri	5			8	12
Cze					C
Fra	5	35	12		12
Ger	5				16
Ita	5		U,5		5
Pol	U,8		U,16		
Rhi					C
Rum				C	C
Rus					5
USA			U,12	8	16

1974G0

"Fall 1903"

FRENCH IN AFTER ALL

As I have already explained to the players of this game in EMPIRE #8, I was in error in not including the French moves in last issue's adjudication of this game. The adjudication appears below in its corrected form.

ENGLAND (Doyle): F Swe-Bot; F Ska-Swe; F Nwy S F Ska-Swe; F Nth S F Nwy.

FRANCE (Amer): A Bur S A Bel; A Bel S A Bur; A Mar-Pie; F Mid-Wes; F Lyo S F Mid-Wes
 F Naf S F Mid-Wes.

GERMANY (Brennick): A Boh-Gal; A War S A Boh-Gal; A Tyr-Vie; A Ruh-Man; A Hol holds
 F Den S ENGLISH F Ska-Swe.

ITALY (Lipton): F Tyr-Lyo; F Tun-Wes; A Pie-Tus; A Ven-Tus; F Eas-Ion.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (Zimmermann): A Gal-Vie; A Tri S A Gal-Vie; A Ser S A Bul; F Aeg-Gre;
A Bul S TURKISH F Bla-Rum.

RUSSIA (Verheiden): A Ukr-War: A Fin-St.P; F St.P(n.c.)-Bar.

TURKEY (Orakert): A Sev-Rum: F Bla-Bul(e.c.): F Con-Aeg: F Smy-Eas.

Underlined moves are not possible. The supply centers controlled by each player are the same as listed in GRAUSTARK #325. Following these moves, England builds A Edi, Italy removes F Tun, Austria-Hungary builds A Bud, Russia removes F Bar, and Turkey builds A Con. The deadline for "Spring 1904" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 12 APRIL 1975.

ERRATA

The following corrections need to be made in the article which begins on p. 11 of this issue of GRAUSTARK:

1. In the first example, the Italian move F Tyr C A Tun-Map must be underlined.
2. Immediately prior to the first set of moves under Suling 3, insert the words: "In the following adjudication, A Lon-Bel may not move because there is a conflict in orders and the convoy route is not designated."
3. The reference to the "1974 Rulebook" should of course be to the "1971 Rulebook".

19750

"Spring 1901"

IS EVERYBODY HAPPY?

ENGLAND (Laves): F Edi-Wrg: F Lon-Mth: A Liv-Edi.

FRANCE (Johnson): A Mar-Spa: A Par-Gas: F Bre-Mid.

GERMANY (Gillespie): F Kie-Dan: A Mun-Ruh: A Ber-Kie.

ITALY (Westergaard): A Ven holds: F Nap-Ion: A Rom-Apu.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (Haas): A Vie-Tyr: A Bud-Ser: F Tri-Alb.

RUSSIA (Harsney): A War-Ukr: A Mos-Sev: F Sev-Rum: F St.P(s.c.)-Bot.

TURKEY (Leppert): A Con-Bul: F Ank-Con: A Smy holds.

The deadline for "Fall 1901" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 12 APRIL 1975. Players are requested to send in conditional "Winter 1901" builds with them, so that play of the game may be speeded up.

BERLIN: The German Empire announced today that the national munitions industry, General Motors, would be coming out with a new series of family sized, custom, and compact Zeppelin models to commemorate the beginning of the 20th century and to replace the best-selling Tin Zeppies of the 1930's. The new models will have the latest in luxury options: hull-to-hull carpeting, gilt trimmed bomb racks, and an aggressive V-8 turbine engine pair to give the buyer top value for his money and top mileage for his gas marks. At a sneak preview held in Wiesbaden last week selected aeronautical experts got pre-season glimpses of the new Cloudmaster, Skytrain, and Thunderclap models. The latter two were applauded as the most innovative steps taken in German aeronautical engineering in this century, while the Cloudmaster was downgraded as too far ahead of its time. Still more pleasant surprises are in store for the European consumer with the opening of a new assembly plant (for GM Zeppelins of course) in Copenhagen. Many new Scandinavian designs are anticipated.

1974IA - PRESS RELEASES

BERLIN: Vive la France! No Vietnam for me - I'll withdraw in return for a negotiated settlement.

1974HQ (continued from p. 1)

ITALY: Nap, Rom, Tun, Ven. (4) RUSSIA: Mos, Nwy, Rum, St.P, Sev,
AUSTRIA-HUNGARY: Bud, Gre, Ser, War. (6)
Tri, Vie. (5) TURKEY: Ank, Bul, Con, Smy. (4)
Germany and Turkey may each build one new unit; so may Russia if F Swe
is removed. The deadline for these "Winter 1902" moves is NOON, SATUR-
DAY 12 APRIL 1975.

1974GR

"Spring 1904"

Following "Fall 1903" moves, Germany removed F Ska, Italy built A
Ven, and Russia built A Mos.

ENGLAND (Rosenberg): F St.P(n.c.)-Nwy; F Nwy-Ska; F Cly-Nrg; F Mid-Eng;
A Pic S F Bel; F Bel S A Pic.

FRANCE (Howe): No moves received; A Bre & A Par hold.

GERMANY (Burley): A Swe & A Hol hold; A Bur S A Mun; A Pru-Ber; A Mun
S A Pru-Ber.

ITALY (Jacobs): F Eas-Smy; F Ion S AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN F Gre-Aeg; A Ven-Tyr;
A Mar S A Gas; A Gas S A Mar; F Par-Mid; F Wes holds.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (Diller): A Bul-Con; A Ser-Bul; F Gre-Aeg; A Ukr-Sev; A
Rum S A Ukr-Sev; A Gal-Bah; A Sil S RUSSIAN A War-Pru.

RUSSIA (Prosnitz): A Liv-St.P; A War-Pru; A Mos S AUSTRIAN A Ukr-Sev.

TURKEY (Squires): A Sev-Rum; F Aeg-Bul(s.c.); F Bla & F Con S F Aeg-Bul.

Underlined moves are not possible. Turkey retreats A Sev-Arm; the
Austrian A Bul is annihilated. The deadline for "Fall 1904" moves is
NOON, SATURDAY 12 APRIL 1975. John McKeen is stand-by for France.

1974IA

"Spring 1902"

ENGLAND (Harrah): F Nwy & A Edi hold; F Nth-Hel; F Lon-Nth.

FRANCE (Derka): F Por-Spa(s.c.); A Mar-Bur; A Par S A Mar-Bur; A Bre-
Pic; A Bel-Ruh.

GERMANY (Gilinsky): A Ber-Mun; F Kie-Den; A Bur holds (must retreat to
Gas or Bel; please advise soonest).

ITALY (Howe): No moves received; A Tyr, F Tun & A Ven holds. John Mc-
Keen is asked for stand-by "Fall 1902" moves.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (David Dalman, 7714 Reed St., Arvada, Colo. 80003; 303-
422-6036): F Tri holds; A Vie S TURKISH A Ser-Bud.

RUSSIA (Kissner): F St.P(n.c.)-Nwy; F Swe S GERMAN F Kie-Den; F Sev & A
Bud S A Rum; A Rum S A War-Gal; A War-Gal; A Mos-Ukr.

TURKEY (Malay): A Bul-Rum; A Ser & F Bla S A Bul-Rum; F Con-Aeg; A Smy-
Arm.

The deadline for "Fall 1902" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 12 APRIL 1975.

THE DIPLOMACY ASSOCIATION

THE DIPLOMACY ASSOCIATION is the hobby's first organization open to everyone. Since its inception in 1971, TDA has maintained its membership fee at a nominal dollar a year. Checks should be made payable and mailed to: THE DIPLOMACY ASSOCIATION, c/o Mr. John J. Beshara, 155 West 68th Street, New York, N. Y. 10023

c00

On January 23, 1975, John Beshara, Chairman of the Board of THE DIPLOMACY ASSOCIATION, received a letter from Fr. Daniel Gorham. Fr. Gorham, who is recuperating after being hospitalized, is at the Benedictine Monastery in Pecos, New Mexico. In his letter, Fr. Gorham states, "The Fighter's Home" will be published again with myself as editor and John Weswig, of Corvallis, Ore., printing it and mailing it out."

According to the information TDA has, all of TFR's games are currently being managed by carbon copy. If there are any players whose games are not being run, kindly contact TDA Director Eric Verheiden, Marks House 1-89, Cal. Tech., Pasadena, Calif. 91126. And anyone who has paid a gamefee for a game that has not yet begun should also contact Mr. Verheiden.

c00

TURNABOUT, published by Peter A. Berggren, Davistown Schoolhouse Road, Orford, N. H. 03777, is the finest new journal -- content, reproduction, presentation and literary merit -- I've seen since stumbling into the hobby. It looks like Xerox but I am told it is actually a combination of computer and photo. And a cover using four colors is planned. Suitable photographs or paintings are being sought. TURNABOUT will become a collector's item and since it is only in its sixth issue, I would urge your readers to get all back issues, so they will have a complete set. The subscription rates are 10 for \$2.00 and there are limited openings in regular Diplomacy, Middle Earth V Diplomacy, Colonial Variant, Gigaton Bomb Variant, and Interplanetary Warfare. The gamefee is \$1.00 for regular Diplomacy and \$1.25 for variants, plus the maintenance of a subscription. The games are guaranteed by TDA and DNYMPA. Since THE DIPLOMACY ASSOCIATION also guarantees the regular games of the DNYMPA and will assist to the utmost with variant games, TURNABOUT also has a guarantee by THE DIPLOMACY ASSOCIATION.

- John J. Beshara, Chairman of the Board, THE DIPLOMACY ASSOCIATION

"A MORE INSANE PUBLISHER NEVER DID IN THIS LAND EXIST..."

Bob Lipton, publisher of the Mixamazu Gazette, has brought forth a magnificent tour de force entitled The Publisher. It is nothing less than a complete re-write of The Mikado. Every one of its songs is re-done in the context of the rivalries of postal Diplomacy, as Connie-Poo comes to New York City to seek the beautiful Penny, though hotly pursued by the vindictive Evansha and by the Publisher. They run afoul of the Lord High Blacklister, Nicky. One character is the pompous and ubiquitous Boar-Pah, who has such lines as, "I am, in point of fact, a particularly haughty and exclusive editor, of pre-Buchananite publication. We all understand when I say that I can trace my zine, in an unbroken line, back to a two-page flier in an sf zine." Other characters include Gil-Peen, Stephen-Sing, and Dun-Tush. The songs include "I've Got A Little List", previously printed in GRAUSTARK #317.

Copies are available, at what price I know not, from Bob Lipton, P. O. Box 360, Lafayette College, Easton, Penn. 18042.

UP THE EMPIRE!

As you were all informed a few months ago, GRAUSTARK has begotten a spin-off called EMPIRE. EMPIRE carries postal games of SPI's Fall of Rome and Frigate, and is currently organizing a game of Origins of World War II. (All fees are \$5 except for the Complex scenarios in Frigate, for which see a current EMPIRE.)

If you neglected to subscribe to EMPIRE, here is a brief review of what you missed:

#1: Announcement of a second Fall of Rome tourney, and an account of forthcoming war games from Simulations Publications Inc. (SPI). This account devoted particular attention to the recently published revisions of SPI's tactical pre-17th century games.

#2: A long letter column with discussion of Frigate's rules, the first moves of the new Fall of Rome tourney, and more on new SPI games.

#3: "A Synoptic Key to Causation in World War II", a valuable aid to play of that popular SPI game. If you want to know what happens following the invasion of Vichy France, or the German attack on Russia, just look at this convenient guide. There is also an article by Even Jones on how to stack and re-stack your counters in this game, and news from the Balkan Massif on the award of the 1974 Ignobel Prizes.

#4: This issue leads off with the first in a series of articles about SPI's old and new PRESTAGS ("Pre-Seventeenth Century Tactical Gaming System") games, listing all the pieces used in them. Also, Dave Darden puts forward some ideas about the play of World War II, I put forward a new scenario for that game, and Mark Zimmermann has a new scenario for Fall of Rome. And Dave Isby and Bob Lipton add some poetry.

#5: There is an article on leadership and command control in PRESTAGS, and the the final score of the first GRAUSTARK/EMPIRE Fall of Rome tourney. (Scenario VI, won by Len Soensny.) From the Four And A Half Kingdoms comes news of the Skandalous gaming firm Stimulations Publications Inc. and its games.

#6: The lead article tries to apply the PRESTAGS system to the Battle of Samla Pass, won during the Hyborian Age by Conan against the hordes of Netchk. There is also a complete bibliography of all articles about the Four And A Half Kingdoms in GRAUSTARK, FREEDONIA, or EMPIRE.

#7: There is here a long article on SPI's forthcoming games, including Frederick the Great, Dreadnought, the Battle of Germany, the Battle of Wurzburg (Spring 1977), the Qued system, the Battle of the Chinese Farm (1973), Fast Carriers, and an ambitious thing called Twentieth Century. Also, Al Nofi reviews a fascinating book entitled The Historian as Detective: Essays on Evidence.

#8: Nofi and Boardman rob mailbags in the Four And A Half Kingdoms, and publish the results.

Also, in all issues, the postal games of Fall of Rome (Attila) and Frigate march onward. Individual back issues of EMPIRE are 25¢ each; subscriptions are 10 issues for \$2, and may be extended backwards to cover earlier issues. All back issues are in stock.

*

GRAUSTARK, the oldest bulletin of postal Diplomacy, is 25¢ a copy or 10 issues for \$2 from John Boardman, 234 E. 19th St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 11226. Back issues are 10 issues for \$1; see #325 for a list of available ones. Also available are the last 28 issues (##30-57) of FREEDONIA, a game devoted to the postal play of Avalon-Hill's Origin of World War II (designed by James Dunnigan). This FREEDONIA file is \$1.50. Diplomacy was designed by Allan B. Calhaver and is published by Games Research Inc. Frigate was designed by Dunnigan and Fall of Rome by John Young and Redmond Simonsen; both are published by Simulations Publications Inc.

MULTIPLE WORLDS, AND THE APPEARANCE OF AN IDEOLOGY, IN THE GAME OF DIPLOMACY

By Allan B. Calhauer

I. Measure, Counter-Measure, and Counter-Counter-Measure

Years ago, when I played face-to-face Diplomacy frequently with the same small group, two of the players began the practice of allying with each other in every game. With the other players allying here and there according to no set pattern, these two players obviously had an advantage, since, in the event that a war developed at uneven odds, they were far more likely to be on the long than on the short side of the odds.

Of course, the pattern in their play was noticed after a few games. It was then quickly mentioned to all the other players at the start of a game. The remaining five players then swarmed the offending two and knocked them out, after which their play returned to a more nearly typical pattern.

On another occasion, a friend of mine and I made a personal alliance to extend over all our games. We then considered all the possible combinations of countries we could draw (for countries were always assigned by chance, as per the rulebook, in those groups). There are 21 such combinations. We decided that nine of the 21 combinations lent themselves to the particular scheme we had in mind. For each of those nine combinations, we devised first moves which would get the two countries off to a good start as allies. Using these moves, we not only always had a good alliance, but were relieved of the necessity of negotiating it. We usually went out together, for appearances' sake, only briefly at the end of the first negotiating period, and sometimes came back in looking angry.

I do not know whether the crowd sensed the pattern or not, but they were pretty good players, and about the third time we used this "super-alliance", as we called it, we began to run into tough resistance on every front. Finally, the other partner decided that I must have a "super-alliance" going with someone else on the board, conflicting with his; which notion was wrong, but in any case he spilled the beans and the "super-alliance" came to an end.

In a sense, one might regard alignment and realignment based upon positional considerations as the measure, the permanent alliance as the counter-measure, and the swarming of the permanent allies as the counter-counter-measure. It is then apparent that the succession of measure and counter-measure need not stop at any given point; but there is hardly any need to develop and prepare highly sophisticated counters, where there is little likelihood that one will be faced with the corresponding measures.

The evolution described above occurred in face-to-face groups, where the same or nearly the same seven players played in one game after another. Such an evolution is not so likely to occur in postal Diplomacy, where there are many players in the pool, and a player does not play with the same opponents so often.

II. The Appearance of an Ideology

A result similar to that of the permanent alliance can nevertheless be arrived at in postal Diplomacy by developing a group of players who will continually ally with one another, large enough that two or three members can be expected to appear in each game. It is hard to assemble such a group, and hard to assemble it secretly. However, an ideology which has the effect of assembling such an ingroup will also carry with it all the advantage of such an ingroup.

Thus it is not so strange as it seems at first glance, that a game as abstract as Diplomacy should give rise to an ideology.

The adherents to this ideology apparently hold as their major principles, that alliances should not be violated under any circumstances, and that they will not ally with any player with whom they have had unfavorable experience in this regard. They will thus gravitate into alliance with each other, and they prefer to ally with each other anyway, as some of their letters have indicated. It is obvious that many games are necessary in order for this ingroup to develop. They must proselytize; they must build up a file of experience on other players; they must adhere, at least to a degree, to their ideology, themselves, as a confidence builder, in games in which they could do better by discarding it or holding it in abeyance. They must lose this game, to win that.

This ideology then requires multiple worlds, that is, many games including overlapping personnel. It is, of course, subject to the criticism on grounds of realism that the nations fighting the First World War did not have the option before them of losing the first nine in order to win the next six.

III. Certain States Into Which the Competition May Fall

Let us first consider two simple states into which the competition may fall, depending upon the attitudes of the players toward the ideology just described:

State I: All the players generally treat all agreements as void when no longer appropriate to the situation; or, in other words, they "stab".

State II: All the players strictly adhere to any agreements they make.

Now first of all we note that in neither of these two cases does any player have any advantage over the others, based upon the given facts alone, since they are all playing the same way in each game. It is, of course, true, that this player may feel more at home in State I; while that player has had more experience or done more thinking in State II; this player may enjoy a State I game more, although he does better in State II games, while State I games drive that player up the wall; although he loses his State II games, and so on; but all these situations require new facts, frequently of an arbitrary, evanescent, or complicated character.

The only State we will consider which does not make use of alternate worlds is State I. Conceivably a hundred games of State I could be played by the same group, the play in each game being in no way dependent upon the course of any previous game. However, it is not likely that any group will play State I games continually, because, for competitive reasons, sooner or later the permanent alliance, in one of its guises or another, will arise, carrying the competition into State III:

State III: Certain players adhere strictly to the agreements they make, and others do not; those who do, so nearly as possible, making agreements only with each other.

In this State, it is quite obvious that the players of the cartel, as I shall call it, have the advantage over the other players, just as they did in the face-to-face situation described earlier.

This situation must be regarded as intolerable by sensible players outside the cartel. One obvious corrective effort, by analogy with the action taken in the face-to-face games, might be expressed as State IV:

State IV: Players threatened by the cartels of State III form cartels of their own for the limited purpose of defeating the cartels of State III.

To the argument that still a cartel results, of course, the answer is that that gage was thrown down by others, and this may be the only way it can be picked up.

IV. Cartels and Stabs, Stabs and Cartels

Players attempting to develop an anti-cartel cartel might find themselves cast in the role of defending the "stab". It must be remembered that the other side of the coin to the "stab" is the cartel. Players defeated by a "stab" sometimes become violently angry, apparently partly because the stab is quick and abrupt in character. It is also hard to conceal. The evil of the cartel is not so obvious. I have recently been defeated by a cartel; it was six or eight moves before I learned, rather by accident, that the cartel members were regularly photocopying and exchanging my diplomatic correspondence. The game might easily have been played through without my ever learning that fact.

It should also be borne in mind that there has been a great deal of propaganda against the "stab"; hardly any against the cartel. Needless to say, some, though by no means all, of this propaganda has been generated by the ideologues, in the course of developing their cartels. The result is an unfair picture of the relative disadvantages. Would you really rather be beaten by a cartel than by a stab? Is there any more advantage in winning through a cartel than through a stab?

It must be remembered that the "stab" is permissible in this game; judging by some of the attitudes I have encountered, I have almost begun to wonder if it was against the rules. It would be possible, though to no purpose, to drive the rock move out of chess, by refusing to play with anyone who moved his rooks; eventually, given only sufficient popular support, the variant thus created might conceivably shoulder out the original game.

What usually happens in a State I game is that the players play with a small reserve, either a unit or two, or sometimes only a unit moved conservatively to do the double duty of reserve and front line. The basic idea is to make the "stab" unfavorable by being able to delay it, until, hopefully, someone will hit the aggressor in the rear. Sometimes circumstances compel the player to commit pieces he had intended to use as reserves; then, of course, the likelihood of a "stab" goes up, but, inasmuch as it was enabled by the whole historical development of the game, it is understood and accepted by the victim.

One reason cartel players have the advantage in State III games is that they can put everything they have into the line from the very start, not bothering with reserves. In a single, isolated game, they run the risk of a bad "stab"; but by developing a class of players faithful to the ideology, they are protected by the fact that their fellow member will not break the cartel, since he wants to be inside it in other games.

Some players, of course, including some who read this analysis, may prefer to follow the path of the cartel. It should be borne in mind that the cartel has certain other problems. If there are, say, three players in the cartel, and they get off to a good start, it will soon appear that one of them has the best chances of the three, and another the worst. Now if the lesser two, as bound by the cartel, continue to cooperate with the leader, they are thereby sacrificing as a practical matter all their winning chances; although, if they coalesced against the leader, they might have winning chances. It is probably true that they, in return, enhance their drawing chances. It may be argued that a three-way draw is a respectable finish in a seven-way game. The matter depends upon

what you mean by "respectable". Players who preferred State I or State IV might say that a fighting three-way draw was respectable, and a cartelized one was not.

Some cartel players also appear to want to justify some of their decisions on an ideological basis; notably their decision to turn upon and eliminate some one of the outer circle of their allies, who has not violated the ideology by "stabbing", but who, since he is simply not a member of the inner circle, will be the next to go, anyway. Here they have relied upon two minor points of ideology. One is to make finicky hair-line distinctions concerning what was actually agreed upon. Another is to cite any tactical slip by the victim as the excuse for attacking him. This latter is interesting, in the annals of excuse-making, because there is nothing else in the ideology that deals with tactical slips in any way, however indirectly: apparently they actually do violate their alliances to attack a player so marked out, so that they do violate their ideology themselves at such times; and no one not knowing that this point was ideological in character would suppose that a tactical slip would have such extraordinary diplomatic repercussions.

Finally, a player who has winning chances may feel some pressure to accept a draw, in order to remain in the cartel for the next game.

V. Possible Future Developments

If players outside the cartel in Stage III fail in an effort to develop fully State IV, then one would expect the game to drag along in State III, giving the advantage, over and over, to the same knot of persons, probably longtime players who have a considerable correspondence; in most cases, newer players, less frequent players, and other players continually taking a disproportionate share of the losses.

There is some possibility, then, that the game would begin to veer into State II. Then the ideologue would presumably be faced with the problem of remaining true to the ideology, in which case all his current advantage would become diluted away, and he would appear to be, not a good player, but just someone who caught onto one idea which worked for the time being; or, to be a good player, he would have to devise some counter-measure to his own cartel, which would require him to desert his ideology. The problem has apparently already been encountered, and good play won out over ideology, where the inner three members of the cartel stabbed the fourth, employing the "tactical slips" excuse.

If an effort were made to establish State IV, and the result were a nip and tuck battle with the cartel, a state of affairs might arise somewhat similar to the two-party system in politics. Unfortunately, the first stage of every game would be highly influenced by the mere numbers of members of each system present. If one cartel had four players in the game, the other three would be beaten from the start, without a chance. If it stood, say, three to two, with two independents, the three would have the best chance. Needless to say, this is not an argument against raising an opposition cartel. Without such a force, the game might easily be, three cartel players shooting fish in a barrel of four independents; or, as in a recent game, four cartel members knocking off the three independents, after which the inner three knocked off the fourth cartel member, after which a three-way draw was declared.

The analogy to the two-party system might be drawn out at great length, each separate game being analogous to a separate state or district.

If the effort described by State IV succeeded, one would probably expect something like State I, occasionally slipping into State III, necessitating recourse to State IV again.

THE DIPLOMACY ASSOCIATION presents

RECOMMENDED CONVOY RULINGS

1. If a convoying fleet is dislodged, the army does not move. (Rule XII.3 of the 1971 Rulebook.) Example:

ITALY: A Tun-Nap; F Tyr C A Tun-Nap; A Rom S A Tun-Nap

FRANCE: F Nap-Tyr; F Wes S F Nap-Tyr.

TURKEY: F Ion-Nap.

Since the convoying fleet (F Tyr) is dislodged, the convoyed army (A Tun) has no effect on the province (Naples) to which it is ordered. Thus, F Ion-Nap is unopposed and succeeds. Note the support of A Rom is irrelevant.

2. Unless otherwise indicated, a convoyed army moves exclusively by its own fleets:

ENGLAND: A Lon-Bel; F Eng C A Lon-Bel.

GERMANY: F Nth C ENGLISH A Lon-Bel.

Since England designated F Eng as the convoying fleet, the German order for F Nth is invalid. Note: When F Eng is not ordered to convoy and F Nth is ordered to convoy, as in this example, the army may move.

3. An army being convoyed by foreign fleets should designate the route. Examples:

ENGLAND: A Lon-Bel.

FRANCE: F Eng C ENGLISH A Lon-Bel.

GERMANY: F Nth C ENGLISH A Lon-Bel.

In the following adjudication, A Lon-Bel may move because the convoy route is designated:

ENGLAND: A Lon-Bel C FRENCH F Eng.

FRANCE: F Eng C ENGLISH A Lon-Bel.

GERMANY: F Nth C ENGLISH A Lon-Bel.

Sample Rulings 2 and 3 are intended to replace Rule XII.4 of the 1974 Rulebook.

4. If a convoyed army's attack would affect the position of any of its convoying fleets, the army may not move. Examples:

A convoyed army's attack may not cause the dislodgement of any of its convoying fleets:

 * Copyright (c) 1974 by THE DIPLOMACY ASSOCIATION. *
 * All rights reserved. *

ENGLAND: A Lon-Bel; F Eng C A Lon-Bel.

GERMANY: F Bel S ENGLISH F Eng.

FRANCE: F Mid-Eng; F Bre S F Mid-Eng.

A Lon may not move because its attack cuts the support of its own conveying fleet provided by Germany's F Bel and thereby causes the dislodgement of its conveying F Eng.

A convoyed army's attack may not prevent the dislodgment of any of its conveying fleets:

ENGLAND: A Lon-Bel; F Eng C A Lon-Bel.

FRANCE: F Bre-Eng; F Bel S F Bre-Eng.

F Eng is dislodged. A Lon may not move because it cuts the support against its conveying fleet and thereby prevents F Eng from being dislodged.

Sample Ruling 4 is intended to replace Rule XII.5 of the 1971 Rulebook.

Additional examples relating to convoys are recommended, as presented by THE DIPLOMACY ASSOCIATION in Eric Verheiden's original article, "Convoys Aren't A Puzzlement".

ooo

GRAUSTARK, the oldest bulletin of postal Diplomacy, is 10 issues for \$2 from John Boardman (address below). Postal Diplomacy game entries are available for \$10; send also a list of the countries you'd like to play, in order of preference. Back issues are 25¢ each or 10 for \$1.

GRAUSTARK #326

John Boardman
234 East 19th Street
Brooklyn, N. Y. 11226
U. S. A.

FIRST CLASS MAIL

In this issue: ALLAN B. CALHMER, designer of Diplomacy, writes on the psychology of stabs and cartels.